

Dear Paul - 1/1 (me) - Thuis

4/13/71

Dear Paul,

This is a kind of unhappy anniversary, this letter. When the Peebs (probably Army) took such good care of my previous portable, the advice of my local shop was that I get a Hermes 3000, with none but metal writ parts, where such destruction could not be as easy. Although I couldn't afford it, I followed his advice. I used the machine little until my old Underwood got too bad, even for me. Then I started to use this and like it. I used one ribbon, the original, put a new one in, and lo and behold, besides tearing and punching everything I did, it also lacerated the ribbon. These diagnoses proved correct. This "Galilee" of portables has an inferior platen when new, something in the complaint the meticulous writer was. From I got it back today. Most of me equal to the life of the first ribbon, 10.66--and that with the kindness of the dealer in changing nothing for his labor or the rental during repair.

Enter me, this comment on your excellent 4/9 to Kleinblonst. Have you decided why Sam Stark's draft was not sent? Without knowing that, I've a hunch you'd not be careful about later use of the data device. The fourth paragraph, if you fill, you might want to break down some, perhaps separate complaints, as they are from working against the others. Do you feel that this includes, the way they'll interpret, notes, including handwritten, and possible to get?

I'm glad somebody else is throwing Stark at them. For more than four years I've been so lonely. If you do not recall their interpretation from the source. I've sent you, tell me and I'll repeat it.

There was once a time I was alone in getting delays, from all sources. It is good to be in company. Welcome to the club! But I've had them go much longer.

My today's, to the expert on rampant irresponsibility, not to his assistant fine who isn't. I'm happy to keep it in sight and in responsibility, not to deal with those to whom he passes the buck. Let him refer, but my corollary, I think, will usually be addressed to him, esp. when I have a complaint. In this case I'm stretching something. The law requires no more than that I identify. The latter did that, he knew the latter did that, he wanted to put me to trouble, so tut for tit--and I'm in compliance. I wish I had time and resources to loan them with suits, where I've exhausted my remedies. If I return to AGENT OSWALD, which is now more timely and more possible, I think I'll file a couple more, including those you like, the fingerprint one (remember, Wasp?) probably follow your advice and waste three beginning with the form on the pre-ass pix (they have to have the TV stuff and what was in it the file because of lack, return, watching and, I think, recruiting. And I'll throw Dallas-Fort Worth in too, on that.

In your own thinking, never forget the clause of the investigative exemption they also you omit, for if, in a trial, it could have been available to LHO or Ruby, the exemption no longer obtains. Or to any other litigant not an agency. I don't get answers, but I make a record, when I think of it, and ask "what law"? They haven't any. And don't forget what you haven't seen, not having seen that book I filed in 2569-70, that one of the reasons this law was enacted was to eliminate the "national interest" hoax. Here the House Report is esp. good.

You indicated no distribution. I include a copy for JNS if you've sent this to him.

Best,

RV